arXiv:1410.7096v1 [math.GM] 26 Oct 2014

A NEW PROOF OF VANTIEGHEM'S THEOREM.

KONSTANTINOS GAITANAS

Abstract. We present a new proof of a primality criterion first proved by Emmanuel Vantieghem.

1. Introduction

E. Vantieghem has proved[1] that $p > 2$ is prime if and only if $\prod_{n=1}^{p-1}(b^n+1) \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$.

His proof was based on the following lemma proved also by him.

Lemma 1.1. ***(Vantieghem)*** *Let m be a natural number greater than 1 and let $\Phi_m(X)$ be the m^{th} cyclotomic polynomial.Then*

$$\prod_{\substack{1\le d\le m,\\ (d,m)=1}} (X - Y^d) \equiv \Phi_m(X) \pmod{\Phi_m(Y)} \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}[X,Y]$$

We will prove the *if* case of Vantieghem's theorem without the use of cyclotomic polynomials.Our proof requires only Fermat's Little theorem and some basic facts from the theory of congruences.

2. main theorem

Theorem 2.1. *Let b be a natural number with $2 \le b \le p-1$.Then if $p > 2$ is prime*

$$\prod_{n=1}^{p-1}(b^n + 1) \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}} \quad (1)$$

.

Proof. Let p be an odd prime , r be the order of 2 mod p and $P = \{1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}$.
We will split the proof into two cases for the convience of the reader.

Case 1. $r = p - 1$.

This means for every $n \in P$, $n \equiv 2^m \pmod p, 0 \le m \le p-1$.
It is easy to see that if $n \equiv 2^m \pmod p \Rightarrow b^n + 1 \equiv b^{2^m} + 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$
We can see that after rearranging the factors in the left hand side of (1) we get

$$\prod_{n=1}^{p-1}(b^n + 1) \equiv \prod_{m=1}^{p-1}(b^{2^m} + 1) \equiv (b^1 + 1)\cdot(b^{2^1} + 1)\cdots(b^{2^{p-2}} + 1) \equiv \frac{b^{2^{p-1}} - 1}{b-1} \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$$

.
From Fermat's Little theorem we know that $2^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod p \Rightarrow b^{2^{p-1}} \equiv b \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}} \Rightarrow$

$$\frac{b^{2^{p-1}}-1}{b-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$$

This means $\prod_{n=1}^{p-1}(b^n+1) \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$ and the first case is proved.

Case 2.$r < p-1$.

This means that the numbers $1, 2^1, \ldots, 2^{r-1}$ are incogruent $\pmod p$ and from Fermat's little theorem we know that $r \mid p-1$.
We will split the set $P = \{1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}$ into $k = \frac{p-1}{r}$ subsets in the following way:

Let $A_1 = \{1, 2^1, \ldots, 2^{r-1}\}$be the first set and $a_i \in P$ be the smallest integer that is not contained in any of the sets $A_1, \ldots, A_{i-1}$.
Then $A_i = \{a_i \cdot 1, a_i \cdot 2^1, \ldots, a_i \cdot 2^{r-1}\}$.

We shall prove that if the elements of the subsets are reduced modulo p then
$A_1 \cup A_2 \ldots \cup A_k = P$ and it suffices to prove that all the elements of the sets are pairwise incogruent modulo p.

If two elements belong in the same set A_i, suppose that $a_i \cdot 2^m \equiv a_i \cdot 2^n \pmod p$ with $n < m$. Since $p \nmid a_i$ we obtain $2^n \equiv 2^m \pmod p$ which leads to a contradiction since by definition the numbers $1, 2, \ldots, 2^{r-1}$ are all incogruent modulo p.

We consider now the case when two elements belong to different sets.

Suppose that $a_j \cdot 2^m \equiv a_i \cdot 2^n \pmod p$, $1 \leq m, n \leq r-1$ and without loss of generality $i < j$.
Multiplying both sides with 2^{r-m} yields $a_j \cdot 2^r \equiv a_i \cdot 2^{r+n-m} \pmod p \Rightarrow a_j \equiv a_i \cdot 2^{r+n-m} \pmod p$.
But this means that $a_j \in A_i = \{a_i \cdot 1, \ldots, a_i \cdot 2^{r-1}\}$,which is a contradiction since a_j is by definition the smallest integer not belonging in any of the sets $A_1, \ldots, A_i, \ldots, A_{j-1}$.
This means that every natural number not greater than $p-1$ is an element in its reduced form in exactly one of the sets A_i, $1 \leq i \leq k$, which yields $A_1 \cup A_2 \ldots \cup A_k = P$.

This means for every $n \in P$, $n \equiv a_i \cdot 2^m \pmod p, 0 \leq m \leq r-1$.
So, $b^n \equiv b^{a_i \cdot 2^m} \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$ and we can obtain that

$$\prod_{n=1}^{p-1}(b^n+1) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{p-1}{r}} \cdot \prod_{m=0}^{r-1}(b^{a_i \cdot 2^m}+1) \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$$

But we can see that

$$\prod_{m=0}^{r-1}(b^{a_i \cdot 2^m}+1) = ((b^{a_i})^1+1)((b^{a_i})^{2^1}+1)\cdots((b^{a_i})^{2^{r-1}}+1) = \frac{(b^{a_i})^{2^r}-1}{b^{a_i}-1}$$

.
Since $2^r \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and $p \nmid a_i$, $(b^{a_i})^{2^r} - 1 \equiv b^{a_i} - 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}} \Rightarrow \frac{(b^{a_i})^{2^r}-1}{b^{a_i}-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$.
This means $\prod_{m=0}^{r-1}(b^{a_i \cdot 2^m} + 1) \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p-1}{b-1}}$ and we can obtain immediatelly:

$$\prod_{n=1}^{p-1}(b^n + 1) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{p-1}{r}} 1 \equiv 1^{\frac{p-1}{r}} \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{b^p - 1}{b-1}}$$

This completes the proof.

□

3. numerical examples

Let $p = 89$ and $b = 2$. The order of 2 modulo 89 is $r = 11$.

The subsets from our proof are

$$A_1 = \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 39, 78, 67, 45\}$$
$$A_2 = \{3, 6, 12, 24, 48, 7, 14, 28, 56, 23, 46\}$$
$$A_3 = \{5, 10, 20, 40, 80, 71, 53, 17, 34, 68, 47\}$$
$$A_4 = \{9, 18, 36, 72, 55, 21, 42, 84, 79, 69, 49\}$$
$$A_5 = \{11, 22, 44, 88, 87, 85, 81, 73, 57, 25, 50\}$$
$$A_6 = \{13, 26, 52, 15, 30, 60, 31, 62, 35, 70, 51\}$$
$$A_7 = \{19, 38, 76, 63, 37, 74, 59, 29, 58, 27, 54\}$$
$$A_8 = \{33, 66, 43, 86, 83, 77, 65, 41, 82, 75, 61\}$$

The numbers $a_2 = 3, a_3 = 5, a_4 = 9, a_5 = 11, a_6 = 13, a_7 = 19$ and $a_8 = 33$ are the least natural numbers not greater than 89 not appearing in any of the previous subsets $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, A_6, A_7$ and A_8 respectively.
We can verify by brute force that $(2^1 + 1)(2^2 + 1)(2^3 + 1) \cdots (2^{88} + 1) \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{89} - 1}$

References

[1] E. Vantieghem, On a congruence only holding for primes II, arXiv:0812.2841 [math.NT], 2008.

MSC2010: 11A07, 11A41

National Technical University of Athens, School of Applied Mathematical and Physical Sciences

E-mail address: raffako@hotmail.com